UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| - | No. 96-6399 | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|-----------|-------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, | | Plaintif: | f – Appel | llee, |
| versus | | | | , |
| LEON HARRELL, | | | | |
| | | Defendant | - Appell | lant. |
| Appeal from the United Statrict of North Carolina, Chief District Judge. (CR | at Greensboro | . Frank W. I | | |
| Submitted: June 20, 1996 | | Decided: | July 2, | 1996 |

Leon Harrell, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Stanley Glaser, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Before HALL, WILKINS, and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (1988) motion. Appellant's case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1988). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Appellant that the failure to file timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Appellant failed to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

The timely filing of objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned that failure to object will waive appellate review. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 93-94 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Appellant has waived appellate review by failing to file objections after receiving proper notice. We accordingly deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED